

**REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the non-final Office Action dated October 5, 2006. Claims 9-18 are pending. In the October 5, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,918,217 to Maggioncalda et al. (“Maggioncalda”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,681 to Levine et al. (“Levine”). Claims 9, 14, 16 and 17 are amended herein. Claims 13 and 15 are canceled. Claims 9 and 17 were amended to include features of canceled claims 13 and 15. Claims 14 and 16 were amended to depend from Claim 9, rather than canceled claims 13 and 15. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Each of the pending claims stand rejected as obvious over Maggioncalda in view of Levine. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show: (1) a suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) that the prior art reference teaches or suggests all the claim limitations. *See MPEP §§ 706.02(j) and 2143.*

Maggioncalda discloses a user interface system for a financial advisory system. In Maggioncalda, user selection criteria are entered via sliders, the position of the sliders determining a stock selection. (*See* Maggioncalda Figs. 14a, 14b.) Entries in the stock selection can be selected and “locked” at a set value. (*See, e.g.,* Fig. 14b, 1450.)

Levine discloses a stateless shopping cart for on-line shopping. In the on-line shopping cart, a selection of products can be displayed in a window. (*See* Levine Fig. 4, window 61.) An individual product can be selected from the window and further information on the selected product can be obtained by pressing the “view information” button 65. As noted in the specification, it is generally possible for a user to make detailed assessments of only a very limited range of products/services. (*See id.* at 4 ll. 15-26.)

The present application addresses the limitations of the prior art by providing an apparatus for aiding the decision making process which includes recommendation logic responsive to user input which generates a score for products/services indicative of how closely the products/processes match with user selection criteria. A predetermined number of the products/services most closely matching the user selection criteria is then displayed on a user

interface together with the input selection criteria. Further information on individual products and processes can then be obtained by selecting the displayed products/services.

Neither Maggioncalda nor Levine, alone or in combination, teaches the invention claimed in herein. More specifically, none of the cited art suggests calculating a match score for products/services, selecting a predetermined number of the closest matching products/services for display, and displaying the selected predetermined number of closest matching products/services, where the displayed predetermined number of products/services are themselves selectable so as to obtain further information on the products/services.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of claims 9-12, 14 and 16-18 is respectfully requested. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in a effort to advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Paul A. Ragusa  
PTO Reg. No. 38,587  
(212) 408-2588

Robert L. Maier  
PTO Reg. No. 54,291  
(212) 408-2538

*Attorneys for Applicants*

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112